

REMARKS

This amendment is filed in response to the office action dated March 6, 2008 (hereinafter "Office Action.")¹ Claims 1-19 were presented for examination and were rejected. Claims 1-8 and 10-19 are amended. Claim 20 is added. No new matter is added; support for the amendments and claim 20 can be found in the application as filed, further explained below (pg 23). No claims are canceled. Thus, claims 1-20 are pending.

The disclosure is objected to (Office Action, pg 3) because of informalities; Applicants have amended the specification to address the particular informalities raised by the Examiner and have amended the specification to address other typographical errors, etc., that have been noted while reviewing the specification. No new matter is added. Consequently, it is respectfully requested that the objection to the disclosure be withdrawn.

Claims 2-6, 8, 10-13, 16 and 18-19 are objected to (Office Action, pg 4) because of informalities; Applicants have amended each of these claims, at least for purposes of addressing the particular informalities raised by the Examiner. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this objection to these claims on the basis of informalities be withdrawn.

Claims 15-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as their invention (Office Action, pg 6). Applicants have amended these claims in a

¹ The Office Action may contain a number of statements characterizing the cited references and/or the claims which Applicants may not expressly identify herein. Regardless of whether or not any such statement is identified herein, Applicants do not automatically subscribe to, or acquiesce in, any such statement.

manner to address the particular issues raised by the Examiner with respect to these claims. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter (Office Action, pg 8). Without acquiescing in this rejection, Applicants have amended these claims in a manner to avoid usage of the term “modules” thereby obviating the rejection.

Claims 1-5 and 7-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being un-patentable over Lue Chee Lip et al. (U.S. 2002/0099794 A1; hereinafter “Lip”) in view of Farenden (U.S. 2002/0128894 A1; hereinafter “Farenden”). Claims 6 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being un-patentable over Lip in view of Farenden as applied to claims 1-5 and 7-11, further in view of Williams (U.S. 2004/0243435; hereinafter “Williams”). Claims 13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being un-patentable over Lip in view of Williams. Claims 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being un-patentable over Farenden in view of Lip and Williams. These rejections are traversed because these references, taken individually or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in Applicants’ claims for at least the following reasons.

Consider, for example, claim 1 which is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being un-patentable over Lip in view of Farenden. Claim 1 recites:

An inmate visitation system, comprising:

means for receiving a visitation request from an inmate for a plurality of potential visitors to attend the same visitation,

means for sending from one of the plurality of potential visitors a registration request for each of the plurality of potential visitors based upon the received visitation request;

means for receiving registration information based upon the sent registration request;

means for determining whether the visitation request from the inmate is approved or disapproved; and

means for communicating the approval or disapproval of the visitation request.

(Claim 1, emphasis added) The Office Action (pg 9) admits that Lip does not teach “means for sending a registration request based upon the received visitation request” which is language that remains included within the currently-amended claim element “means for sending from one of the plurality of potential visitors a registration request for each of the plurality of potential visitors based upon the received visitation request” (emphasis added) of currently-amended claim 1. Therefore Lip does not teach this claim element.

The Office Action relies on Farenden, paragraphs 118 and 119, to teach “means for sending a registration request based upon the received visitation request” (Office Action, pg 9). Farenden discloses a system for recruiting candidates for employment. (title) Paragraph 118 of Farenden discusses candidate identification, presenting four categories of candidate: web candidates, current interns, pre-selected candidates and referred candidates. Paragraph 119 discusses the completion of an employment skill questionnaire and a personal profile. Clearly, Farenden, including these two paragraphs, relates solely to recruiting candidates for employment purposes, a competitive activity. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Farenden does not teach “means for sending from one of the plurality of potential visitors a registration request for each of the plurality of potential visitors based upon the received visitation request” (emphasis added) as recited in claim 1 for the following reasons.

Inherent in employee-recruitment activity is the competition between and amongst candidates who are going after the same job opening. One candidate normally may not even know the identities of the other candidates who are competing for that job opening. Clearly, when answering an employment ad, the candidate does not know who else is interviewing. Each candidate is operating only on its own behalf and in its own best interest in vying for the job opening. The last thing on the mind of any job candidate would be to send [the equivalent of] “a registration request” by calling or contacting other people (potential job applicants) to have them meet at an appointed place and time with him/her, to compete with him/her for that same job opening, much less compete at the same meeting (“to attend the same visitation” as recited in claim 1) attended by that candidate. However, based on the currently-amended claim language, that is precisely what Farenden would have to teach, in order to read on Applicants’ sending means claim element. Farenden does not teach that. Therefore, Farenden does not teach at least: “means for sending from one of the plurality of potential visitors a registration request for each of the plurality of potential visitors based upon the received visitation request.”

In fact, Farenden teaches away from this limitation because of the inherent competitiveness involved in the scenario in Farenden wherein competing candidates are vying for the same job opening - that is an opposite activity from that of inviting other cooperative parties to come along to meet with an incarcerated inmate. In Farenden you would like to be the only possible job-applicant candidate if possible; but, in Applicants’ disclosed scenario, there may be substantial advantage to having a team (“a plurality of potential visitors” as recited in claim 1) meet with an incarcerated inmate as Applicants disclose and claim.

Therefore, since Lip, admittedly, does not teach or suggest this claim element and since Farenden, as shown above, does not teach or suggest this claim element, then Lip and Farenden, individually, or in any reasonable combination,² do not teach or suggest this claim element of claim 1, or claim 1 itself. Accordingly, the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Independent claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being un-patentable over Lip in view of Farenden. Claim 7 recites, *inter alia*: “sending from one of the plurality of potential visitors a registration request for each of the plurality of potential visitors based upon the received visitation request” and is allowable for the same reasons given with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claim 7 should be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Independent claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being un-patentable over Lip in view of Williams. The Office Action (pg 15) advises that Lip does not teach a visitation scheduling module and relies upon Williams to teach that subject matter. The term “module” has been deleted from the claim entirely and the claim is further substantially revised in other respects, now being directed to a computer program product. Further, the claim includes the same, or a similar, limitation to that described above with respect to claims 1 and 7 (which makes those claims allowable over Lip and Farenden for reasons given above.)

Without acquiescing in the combinability of Lip with Williams, *arguendo*, Lip and/or Williams do not disclose or suggest at least: (1) “visitation registration program code for

² Applicants do not acquiesce in the combinability of Lip and Farenden in the first place.

receiving a visitation request from an inmate for a plurality of potential visitors to attend the same visitation” as recited in claim 13 or (2) visitation registration program code for “automatically approving or disapproving a registration request for each of the plurality of potential visitors, the registration request sent from one of the plurality of potential visitors for each of the plurality of potential visitors, based upon the visitation request” as recited in claim 13. In addition, Farenden does not cure the deficiencies of Lip or Williams. Accordingly, the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claim 13 should be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Independent claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being un-patentable over Farenden in view of Lip and Williams. This claim is also not disclosed or suggested by these references. For example, the request in the “receiving a request” limitation of claim 18 is not received in Farenden by one of a plurality of potential visitors, because there is no plurality of potential visitors in Farenden in the first place, for reasons given above. For another example, the requested registration information in the “supplying the requested registration information” limitation is not supplied by one visitor about each of a plurality of potential visitors in Farenden because there is no plurality of potential visitors in Farenden in the first place, for reasons given above. Farenden teaches away from a plurality of job applicants, as explained above. The other references, Lip and Williams, do not cure this deficiency in Farenden.

Therefore, Farenden in view of Lip and Williams do not disclose or suggest at least: (1) “receiving a request to provide registration information in order to schedule visitation with the inmate, the request being received by one of the plurality of potential visitors” as recited in claim 18 or (2) “supplying the requested registration information to a sender of the request, the requested registration information being supplied by the one potential visitor about each one of

the plurality of potential visitors” as recited in claim 18. Accordingly, the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claim 18 should be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Claims 2-6, dependent from claim 1, are allowable, at least for reasons based on their dependencies from allowable base claim 1.

Claims 8-12, dependent from claim 7, are allowable, at least for reasons based on their dependencies from allowable base claim 7.

Claims 14-17, dependent from claim 13, are allowable, at least for reasons based on their dependencies from allowable base claim 13.

Claim 19, dependent from claim 18, is allowable, at least for reasons based on its dependencies from allowable base claim 18.

New claim 20 is allowable over these references because it contains limitations similar to those discussed above.

Support:


Support for these amendments and new claim 20 can be found in the application, as filed. For example, for the claim amendments see at least paragraphs [0030], [0033], [0052], [0062], [0071] and [0073]; and item S1035 in Fig. 10. For new claim 20, see the foregoing references as well as Fig. 1 and discussion thereof in the specification.

CONCLUSION

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendment and remarks.³

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 07-2347 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
Verizon Corporate Services Group Inc.

By: 
Joe Wall
Reg. No. 25,648

Date: May 31, 2008

Verizon
Patent Management Group
1515 Courthouse Road, Suite 500
Arlington, VA 22201 - 2909
Tel: 703.351.3586
Fax: 703.351.3665

³ As Applicant's remarks with respect to the Examiner's rejections are sufficient to overcome these rejections, Applicant's silence as to assertions by the Examiner in the Office Action or certain requirements that may be applicable to such rejections (e.g., whether a reference constitutes prior art, motivation to combine references, assertions as to dependent claims, etc.) is not a concession by Applicant that such assertions are accurate or such requirements have been met, and Applicant reserves the right to analyze and dispute such assertions/requirements in the future.